

## Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02646 01 OF 05 021638 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CCO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 ACDA-19 OMB-01 H-02 SS-14 NSC-10

RSR-01 /142 W

----- 084485

O P 021507 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8295

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY

USDEL SALT TWO II PRIORITY

USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 5 VIENNA 2646

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

EO 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: NETHERLANDS AND US DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN  
ISSUE WITH HUNGARIAN AND SOVIET REPS ON APRIL 2

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02646 01 OF 05 021638 Z

BBEGIN SUMMARY. FURTHER SESSION OF QUADRILATERAL TALKS ON  
HUNGARIAN ISSUE TOOK PLACE MORNING OF APRIL 2 BETWEEN

NETHERLANDS, US AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPRESENTATIVES. SESSION WAS AGAIN INCONCLUSIVE. EASTERN REPS PLACED THEIR MAIN EMPHASIS ON ARGUING THE MERITS OF THEIR ENLARGEMENT PROPOSAL, WHICH THEY SOUGHT TO PRESENT AS A NEUTRAL COMPROMISE AND AS A WAY OF LEAVING THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY OPEN FOR FUTURE DECISION AS THE ALLIES DESIRED. EASTERN REPS SAID THAT AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES WOULD BE EQUITABLE SINCE IT WAS RELATED ONLY TO HUNGARY. HUNGARIAN REP SAID AT THE END OF THE DISCUSSION THAT, ALTHOUGH HE COULD IMAGINE A SITUATION IN THE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH HUNGARY WOULD NOT DEMAND ITALY AS A COUNTERPART FOR ITS OWN INCLUSION IN SPECIFIC MEASURES, IN ANY STATEMENT HUNGARY MIGHT BE CALLED ON TO MAKE AT THIS TIME, HE WOULD HAVE TO MENTION ITALY. ALLIED REPS ARGUED THAT SINCE ONLY THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY WAS AT ISSUE THEIR PROPOSED STATEMENTS PROVIDED A MORE EQUITABLE WAY OF STATING THIS WITHOUT PREJUDICING THE OUTCOME. THEY STRESSED THAT THE SOVIETS WERE DRAGGING IN ITALY AS A PURELY TACTICAL ISSUE, SINCE IT HAD ALREADY BEEN ESTABLISHED IN WRITING THAT ITALY WOULD BE A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT. IT WAS AGREED TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSIONS ON THE MORNING OF APRIL 4 WITH ALL CONCEPTS HERETOFORE ADVANCED OPEN FOR CONTINUED DISCUSSION. END SUMMARY.

2. APRIL 2 SESSION OF QUADRILATERAL DISCUSSIONS TOOK PLACE IN AMERICAN EMBASSY WITH NETHERLANDS AND US REPS REPRESENTING ALLIES, SOVIETS REPRESENTED BY KHLESTOV, KVITSINSKIY AND TIMERBAYEV, AND HUNGARIANS BY USTOR AND PETRAN. NETHERLANDS REP, AS REP OF ALLIES, WELCOMED THE GROUP FOR CONTINUATION OF THE EFFORT TO FIND A NEUTRAL SOLUTION TO THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM.

3. HUNGARIAN REP BEGAN DISCUSSION. HE SAID THE FORMULA PROPOSED BY THE EAST AT THE LAST SESSION FOR A LIST OF 19 PARTICIPANTS, A LIST OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, AND A LIST OF 8 CONSULTATIVE PARTICIPANTS, PLUS A GENERAL FORMULA PERMITTING THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO INVITE OTHER STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN CERTAIN DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS, PROVIDED THEY DID NOT PREJUDICE THE SECURITY OF EITHER SIDE, HAD REAL MERITS AND WAS A GENUINELY NEUTRAL SOLUTION. THIS PROPOSAL ESTABLISHED A GROUP OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AS ACCEPTED BY THE ALLIES, AND STATED THAT THE REMAINING 8 STATES HAD A DIFFERENT POSITION. IT LEFT IN CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02646 01 OF 05 021638 Z

ABEYANCE THE QUESTION OF ENLARGEMENT AS TO WHETHER THE GROUP OF 11 WOULD BE ENLARGED IN THE FUTURE OR NOT. THIS GROUP WOULD HAVE THE RIGHT BY CONSENSUS TO REQUEST ANOTHER STATE TO PARTICIPATE IF THE LATTER WISHED. THUS IT PREJUDICED THE POSITION OF NEITHER SIDE. NOTHING IN IT EXCLUDED THE POSSIBILITY OF MAKING HUNGARY A PARTICIPANT IN CERTAIN MEASURES OR DECISIONS WITHOUT COMPELLING HUNGARY TO DO SO AT THAT LATER TIME WITHOUT POSING ITS OWN REQUIREMENTS AS TO THE INCLUSION OF OTHER STATES. IT SHOULD THUS BE REGARDED AS A SUBSTANTIAL CONCESSION

ON THE PART OF THE EAST. THE EAST WAS WILLING TO GIVE UP ITS ORIGINAL IDEA THAT THE STATUS OF ALL 19 PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE DETERMINED DEFINITELY IN ADVANCE AND INSTEAD TO ACCEPT THE IDEA OF POSTPONING THIS DEFINITIVE DETERMINATION TO THE NEGOTIATIONS, BUT IT WAS NOT WILLING TO ACCEPT THE IDEA THAT HUNGARY SHOULD BE DISTINGUISHED FROM THE OUTSET AS THE SOLE COUNTRY WHICH WOULD BE KEPT IN ABEYANCE. HE BELIEVED THERE WERE GOOD REASONS TO CONSIDER THIS CONCEPT SERIOUSLY AND THAT IT PROVIDED THE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT.

4. KHESTOV SAID THAT RECENTLY THE ALLIES HAD MADE CLEAR THAT THE WEST DOES NOT INSIST ON DECIDING THE ISSUE OF POSSIBLE ENLARGEMENT OF THE GROUP OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AT THIS TIME. THE WEST ALSO URGES A COMPROMISE OR NEUTRAL APPROACH BETWEEN THE TWO POSITIONS. THE ORIGINAL SOVIET POSITION HAD BEEN THAT THEY HAD INSISTED THAT THE PARTICIPATION QUESTION BE DECIDED IN FULL AT THIS TIME, EITHER ON THE BASIS OF THE NON-PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY AMONG THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, OR THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY AND ITALY IN THAT GROUP. THE SOVIETS HAD WANTED TO HEAR WHAT THE ALLIES HAD IN MIND AS REGARDS A NEUTRAL POSITION WHILE MAINTAINING THEIR OWN VIEW THAT IT SHOULD BE DECIDED NOW THAT EITHER HUNGARY WAS OUT OR HUNGARY AND ITALY SHOULD BE INCLUDED. HE AGREED WITH USTOR IN CONSIDERING THE LATEST EASTERN PROPOSAL AS A STEP FORWARD FROM THE EARLIER EASTERN POSITION THAT EVERYTHING SHOULD BE DECIDED AT THIS TIME. THE PRESENT EASTERN POSITION WAS THAT IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO DECIDE NOW WHETHER THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE ENLARGED IN SPECIFIC TERMS OR WHETHER HUNGARY SHOULD BE ADDED ALONG WITH ITALY OR WHETHER HUNGARY SHOULD BE OUT DEFINITELY. THIS NEW POSITION CREATED A GREATER POSSIBILITY OF COMPROMISE, AND THIS SHOULD BE REALIZED BY ALL. SECOND, THE SOVIETS AGREED WITH THE WESTERN VIEW THAT THE SEARCH FOR A COMPROMISE ON ENLARGING THE GROUP OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS MUST BE CARRIED ON IN CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02646 01 OF 05 021638 Z

THE FUTURE IN A NEUTRAL WAY. DURING THE LAST SESSION, THE EASTERN REPS HAD CONCENTRATED ON ASKING ABOUT WESTERN VIEWS ON A NEUTRAL APPROACH. WITH EASTERN PROPOSAL THERE NOW WAS A BASIS FOR A REALLY NEUTRAL APPROACH AND A WAY OF FORMULATING THE PARTICIPATION ISSUE SO THAT IT REALLY REMAINED AN OPEN ONE.

5. THE US REP SAID THAT IT WAS INACCURATE TO STATE AS THE HUNGARIAN REP HAD DONE THAT THE WEST HAD AGREED ...

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02646 02 OF 05 021652 Z

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CCO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 ACDA-19 OMB-01 H-02 SS-14 NSC-10

RSR-01 /142 W

----- 084546

O P 021507 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8296

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY

USDEL SALT TWO

USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 5 VIENNA 2646

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

THAT THERE SHOULD BE ONLY 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE FACT OF THE MATTER WAS THAT THE ALLIES HAD AGREED TO DROP THEIR INSISTENCE THAT HUNGARY SHOULD BE LISTED AS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT IF A SUITABLE, AGREED WAY COULD BE FOUND TO KEEP THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN ABEYANCE FOR DECISION AT A LATER CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02646 02 OF 05 021652 Z

STAGE. AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA MIGHT PROVIDE A BASIS FOR DOING SO, BUT BOTH T AND THE REMAINDER OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER WOULD HAVE TO BE FORMULATED A RPT A THE NEUTRAL WAY. HE HAD ALREADY PROPOSED A SOLUTION WITH 19 PARTICIPANTS, 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, AND APPROPRIATELY WORDED ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, AND A LIST OF 7 SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS. THIS WOULD BE A WAY OF USING THE EASTERN PROPOSAL FOR AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA IN A GENUINELY NEUTRAL WAY RATHER THAN THE INEQUITABLE ONE INVOLVED IN PLACING

HUNGARY AMONG THE SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS.

6. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS HAD PROPOSED AT THE END OF THE LAST SESSION THAT IN VIEW OF A NUMBER OF EASTERN MISCONCEPTIONS CONCERNING THEIR IDEAS FOR AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS, THAT THE DISCUSSION SHOULD BECOME MORE SPECIFIC ON THE PRESENT OCCASION. HE BELIEVED THAT THE DISCUSSION WOULD BECOME MORE CONCRETE WITH GREATER CHANCES OF ADVANCE IF EVERYONE HAD SOMETHING MORE SPECIFIC TO LOOK AT WHICH COULD OBVIATE THE POSSIBILITY OF MISUNDERSTANDING AND CLARIFY THE SENSE OF THE ALLIED PROPOSALS. HE WOULD THEREFORE LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT ON THE SAME INFORMAL AND UNCOMMITTED BASIS AS HERETOFORE THAT ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT ON THE PRESENT OCCASION A MORE SPECIFIC IDEA OF WHAT THEY HAD IN MIND IN RELATION TO A POSSIBLE STATEMENT OR EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS, ON WHICH THE MOST RECENT DISCUSSIONS HAVE CENTERED. HE WISHED TO PRESENT TWO COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS BUT WOULD ALSO LIKE TO REMIND EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES THAT THEY COULD BE COMBINED IN ONE AGREED STATEMENT IF IT WERE PREFERRED. THE NETHERLANDS REP THEN READ OFF TEXTS OF POSSIBLE HUNGARIAN AND WESTERN STATEMENT AS FOLLOWS:

A. POSSIBLE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF HUNGARY AGREES WITH THE VIEW THAT THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY AMONG THE STATES LISTED ABOVE WILL BE DECIDED AT A LATER STAGE. THE MODALITIES AND DEGREE OF HUNGARY'S INCLUSION IN DECISIONS, AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES RELATING TO CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH MAY BE REACHED OR AGREED IN THE COURSE OF THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED AND WILL ALSO BE DECIDED AT A LATER STAGE.

B. POSSIBLE WESTERN STATEMENT

THE REPRESENTATIVES OF ( BLANK) WISH TO POINT OUT THAT THE STATEMENT MADE BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF HUNGARY HAS MADE CLEAR THAT THE ARRANGMENTS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY IN THESE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02646 02 OF 05 021652 Z

CONSULTATIONS ARE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE NATURE OF HUNGARY'S PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS, DECISIONS, OR AGREED MEASURES, OR TO THE SECURITY OF ANY PARTY. IN PARTICULAR, IT IS AGREED THAT THE QUESTION OF HOW AND TO WHAT EXTENT HUNGARY WILL BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE DECISIONS, AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES MUST BE EXAMINED AND DECIDED DURING THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS.  
END TEXT.

7. KHESTOV SAID HIS FIRST IMPRESSION FROM THIS PRESENTATION WOULD BE THAT THERE WOULD BE A LIST OF 7 SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, INCLUDING ITALY. ITALY WOULD THUS BE GIVEN A DIFFERENT STATUS FROM THAT OF HUNGARY IN THE PROPOSED PROCEDURES PAPER. IT HAD AGAIN BEEN AGREED IN THE PRESENT SESSION THAT THE SEARCH FOR A COMPROMISE SHOULD BE CONDUCTED ON A NEUTRAL BASIS, BETWEEN THE TWO OPPOSING POSITIONS. THE STATEMENTS WERE READ OFF BY THE

NETHERLANDS REP MIGHT IN THE ALLIED VIEW REPRESENT A NEUTRAL POSITION BETWEEN THE ALLIED AND EASTERN POSITIONS, BUT THE EASTERN POSITION WAS THAT HUNGARY SHOULD BE COUPLED WITH ITALY. IF THIS VIEW WERE ACTUALLY TO BE TAKEN FULLY INTO ACCOUNT, IT WOULD MEAN THAT THE STATEMENTS SHOULD BE CHANGED SO THAT WHEREVER HUNGARY WAS MENTIONED, ITALY WAS MENTIONED INSTEAD AND HUNGARY WOULD BE PLACED IN THE GROUP OF 7 INSTEAD OF ITALY.

8. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT THE REASONS THE REASON FOR BELIEVING THAT THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO 11 STATES WAS NOT ONLY THAT IT SEEMED IMPOSSIBLE TO REACH AGREEMENT NOW ON A POSSIBLE ENLARGEMENT TO INCLUDE OTHER STATES, IT WAS ALSO BECAUSE ONLY WHEN, DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS, THE GROUP OF 11 WENT INTO DETAILED DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE MEASURES WOULD IT REALLY BECOME CLEAR IN WHAT MEASURES IT MIGHT BE DESIRABLE TO INVOLVE ONE OR THE OTHER ADDITIONAL COUNTRY. HE COULD NOT EXCLUDE THE POSSIBILITY THAT AT THAT TIME THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY MIGHT POSSIBLY DEPEND ON THE INCLUSION OF ITALY, TURKEY OR GREECE, OR ON SOME OTHER CONDITION. BUT THE DECISION ON THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY SHOULD BE POSTPONED UNTIL THE TIME OF THE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS AND ACTUAL DISCUSSIONS IN ORDER TO SEE UNDER WHAT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS AN ENLARGEMENT MIGHT BE PROPOSED. IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO DECIDE NOW WHETHER OR ON WHAT BASIS TO INCLUDE HUNGARY, ITALY OR SOME OTHER COUNTRIES. CONSEQUENTLY, THIS APPROACH WOULD BRING US NEARER TO THE GOAL OF AGREEMENT. AS REGARDS THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED REPS, HUNGARY CONTINUED VERY UNWILLING TO BE SINGLED OUT AND TO BE THE ONLY  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02646 02 OF 05 021652 Z

COUNTRY WHICH WOULD MAKE SUCH A STATEMENT. THE GENERAL ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS THEREFORE EQUITABLE AND FAIR.

9. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO ADD THE FORMULA TO THE STATEMENTS AND THUS USE BOTH. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT THE STATEMENTS SHOULD BE DROPPED AND A NEUTRAL ENLARGEMENT FORMULA USED INSTEAD. THE USE REP AGAIN POINTED OUT THAT ALTHOUGH SOME POINTS MADE BY THE HUNGARIAN REP APPEARED REASONABLE, THE WAY IN WHICH THE EAST WAS PROPOSING THAT THIS BE SET DOWN IN WRITING WAS INEQUITABLE AND COULD PREJUDICE THE

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02646 03 OF 05 021706 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CCO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 ACDA-19 OMB-01 H-02 SS-14 NSC-10

RSR-01 /142 W

----- 084650

O P 021507 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8297

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY

USDEL SALT TWO II PRIORITY

USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 5 VIENNA 2646

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FRO US REP MBFR

OUTCOME. HE BELIEVED THE LIELED CONCEPT OF EXCHANGES OF STATEMENTS CAME CLOSER TO PERFORMING THE SAME FUNCTION.

10. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT A DECISION ON HUNGARIAN INCLUSION COULD NOT BE TAKEN UNTIL THE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS. THE US REP SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES WERE WILLING TO DROP HUNGARY FROM THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AT THIS TIME, CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02646 03 OF 05 021706 Z

THIS ACTION SHOULD BE BALANCED BY A STATEMENT WHICH MADE THE SITUATION AT THE TIME OF THE NEGOTIATIONS CLEAR AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

11. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THE EAST WAS PROPOSING A GENERAL ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WHICH EASTERN REPS INDICATED COULD MEAN THAT HUNGARY MIGHT BE INCLUDED IN MEASURES DURING THE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS. THE ALLIES HAD NOT SINGLED OUT THE OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SUCH AS THE NETHERLANDS SINCE THEY WERE ALREADY IN. ITALY'S STATUS HAD ALSO BEEN ESTABLISHED. ONLY THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY WAS OPEN. THEREFORE, THE ALLIED STATEMENT REFERRED SPECIFICALLY TO HUNGARY. THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT FORMULA DEALT

WITH THE POSSIBILITY THAT IN THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, UNFORESEEN DEVELOPMENTS MIGHT TAKE PLACE. THIS WAS TOO GENERAL A FORMULATION. THE ALLIED STATEMENTS MADE CLEAR WHAT THE ISSUE WAS AND PUT IT FAIRLY.

12. SOVIET REP KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT, IF ITALY WAS OUT THE HUNGARY WAS DEFINITELY OUT, AND THAT WAS THE END OF THE AFFAIR. THE US REP BRIEFLY REVIEWED THE HISTORY OF THE EXCHANGES OF NOTES AND DISCUSSION HERETOFORE, POINTING OUT THAT THE STATUS OF ITALY HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED IN EXCHANGE OF NOTES, THEN THAT OF ROMANIA AND BULGARIA, LEAVING ONLY THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE OPEN.

13. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WOULD CLEARLY NOT LIKE THE IDEA OF SWITCHING THEIR PROPOSED STATEMENTS SO THAT THEY REFERRED TO ITALY AND NOT HUNGARY. THEY WOULD NOT ACCEPT SUCH STATEMENTS IF THEY REFERRED ONLY TO ITALY INSTEAD OF HUNGARY. WHY SHOULD THE EAST FOR ITS PART ACCEPT STATEMENTS WHICH MENTIONED ONLY HUNGARY. THE ALLIES WERE INCLUDING ITALY IN A GROUP OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS AND CONSIDERED THIS PERFECTLY NORMAL. WHEN THE WESTERN REPS SAID THAT IF HUNGARY WERE ADDED TO THIS GROUP THIS WOULD PREDETERMINE THE STATUS OF HUNGARY DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS, IT WAS ONLY LOGICAL IN TERMS OF THESE ALLIED ARGUMENTS, THAT IF ITALY WERE IN THIS LIST, THEN ITS STATUS TOO WOULD BE PREJUDICED AND PREDETERMINED AS EXCLUDED. BUT IF ITALY WERE TO BE OUT THEN HUNGARY HAD TO BE OUT. THESE WERE THE TWO POSSIBILITIES AND THEY WERE VERY CLEAR. IF ITALY WAS MENTIONED IN THE GROUP OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS THEN HUNGARY HAD TO BE THERE TOO. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL OF AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS GENUINELY NEUTRAL. THIS FORMULA, WHICH WOULD BE PLACED IN THE PROCEDURES PAPER DIRECTLY AFTER THE LIST  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02646 03 OF 05 021706 Z

OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, TOOK ACCOUNT OF BOTH POSITIONS WITHOUT DAMAGE TO THE POSITION OF EITHER SIDE. THE CONCEPT WAS BASED ON THE FACT THAT IT SEEMED IMPOSSIBLE TO AGREE NOW THAT EITHER HUNGARY OR ITALY SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OR TO AGREE THAT BOTH SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THAT LIST. THE ALLIES HAD TO BE REALISTIC. IF ITALY WAS OUT, THEN HUNGARY WAS OUT. THE EASTERN REPS HAD NOW PRESENTED A PROPOSAL WHICH LEFT THE SITUATION OPEN FOR LATER DECISION AND A LATER SEARCH FOR A FINAL SOLUTION ON A NEUTRAL BASIS. INCLUDING AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AFTER THE LIST OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE A GENUINELY NEUTRAL SOLUTION. FIRST, BOTH ITALY AND HUNGARY WOULD BE LISTED IN THE GROUP OF 8. THE SAME TREATMENT WOULD BE GIVEN TO BOTH. SECOND, IF IT WERE AGREED BY CONSENSUS OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS THAT THEIR GROUP SHOULD BE ENLARGED AND THE INTERESTED GOVERNMENTS AGREED, AND THE PRINCIPLE OF NO DOMINISHING OF SECURITY OF EITHER SIDE WERE ALSO TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, BOTH COUNTRIES COULD BE INCLUDED IN THE GROUP OR BOTH WOULD REMAIN EXCLUDED. IN EITHER CASE, THE SITUATION OF EACH WOULD BE COMPARABLE. THIS FORMULA PROTECTED THE POSITION OF BOTH SIDES



AND THERE WAS NO ADVANTAGE TO EITHER SIDE. KHLESTOV SAID THAT TO MENTION ONLY HUNGARY AND TO LEAVE ONLY THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION OPEN WOULD GIVE UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE TO TO THE ALLIES SINCE HUNGARY WOULD BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED AND ITALY WOULD NOT BE. IF THE SOVIETS PRESENTED A PROPOSAL SIMILAR TO THAT OF THE ALLIES, WITH ITALY AS A POTENTIAL DIRECT PARTICIPANT, AND HUNGARY AS A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT, THE ALLIES WOULD NOT ACCEPT THIS, SO WHY SHOULD THEY KEEP PUSHING THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY WHILE LEAVING ITALY OUT? THIS APPROACH MEANT THE ALLIES WERE SEEKING UNILATERAL ADVANTAGES FOR THEMSELVES, WHICH WAS THE WRONG APPROACH FOR NEGOTIATIONS. THE EASTERN FORMULA WAS GENUINELY NEUTRAL. EVERYONE GOT EQUAL ADVANTAGE. THE NEUTRAL APPROACH WAS TO LEAVE BOTH COUNTRIES IN THE SAME SITUATION. AN APPROACH WHICH WOULD HELP ONLY ONE SIDE WOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED BY THE OTHER. IF THEY REALLY WANTED A NEUTRAL APPROACH, THE ALLIES SHOULD EXAMINE THE EASTERN FORMULA CAREFULLY. IT WAS GENERAL AND DID NOT SPECIFY ANY COUNTRY AND WAS THEREFORE NEUTRAL. IF THE ALLIES WISHED A VARIANT WHICH WOULD SPECIFY ITALY AND HUNGARY, THE SOVIETS WOULD BE WILLING TO EXAMINE THIS, PROVIDED BOTH WERE IN THE SAME CATEGORY. THE ALLIES SHOULDRE-EXAMINE THIS CONCEPT TO SEE IF IT WAS NOT REALLY A NEUTRAL ONE.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02646 04 OF 05 021720 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CCO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 ACDA-19 OMB-01 H-02 SS-14 NSC-10

RSR-01 /142 W

----- 084759

O P 021507 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8298

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY  
USDEL SALT TWO II PRIORITY  
USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 4 OF 5 VIENNA 2646

E. O. 11652 GDS  
TAGS: PARM  
SUBJ: MBFR: NETHERLANDS AND US DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE  
WITH HUNGARIAN AND SOVIET REPS ON APRIL 2.

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02646 04 OF 05 021720 Z

14. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE EASTERN REPS WERE IN ACTUALITY MERELY PROPOSING THEIR ORIGINAL POSITION IN A DIFFERENT DRESS, THAT OF HUNGARY OUT OF THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE CONCEPT OF LINKING ITALY TO HUNGARY WAS CERTAINLY NOT A CONCESSION FROM THE ALLIED VIEWPOINT. THE ORIGINAL ALLIED PROPOSALS FOR THE COMPOSITION OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS HAD BEEN BALANCED. THE ALLIES HAD ADDRESSED THEIR INVITATIONS TO THOSE COUNTRIES WHOM THEY CONSIDERED TO BELONG TO THE CENTRAL EUROPEAN REGION. THIS CONCEPT HAD BEEN BALANCED BY THE ADDITION OF NETHERLANDS AND BENELUX ON THE ALLIED SIDE. THE ALLIED APPROACH HAD BEEN REASONABLE AND EQUITABLE. TO SUGGEST BRINGING IN ITALY WHICH WAS A MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRY MADE THE WHOLE PACKAGE UNBALANCED. THE EASTERN FORMULA FOR ENLARGEMENT WAS SO VAGUE THAT IT DID NOT REALLY ADD TO THE ALREADY EXISTING CONSENSUS RULE. THE PROCEDURES PAPER COULD ALWAYS BE CHANGED BY CONSENSUS OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SO HE COULD SEE NO PROGRESS AS REGARDS THE SPECIFIC PROBLEM OF PARTICIPATION THROUGH THE USE OF THIS ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. INSTEAD THE GROUP SHOULD WORK ON THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS, WHICH DEALT WITH THE SPECIFIC PROBLEM WE ARE CONFRONTED WITH. IN THE LAST SESSION THE EASTERN REPS HAD CLAIMED THAT THE ALLIED STATEMENTS PREDECIDED THE ISSUE OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. ALLIED REPS HAD SAID THIS WAS BASED ON A MISCONCEPTIONS. THESE WERE IN ANY EVENT QUESTIONS OF DRAFTING. THE EAST SEEMED TO BE PURSUING OTHER INTERESTS BROADER THAN THAT OF THE PARTICIPATION PROBLEM IN PROPOSING ITS ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. IF THE EASTERN REPS WISHED IN ADDITION TO THESE STATEMENTS TO ADD AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA REFLECTING THESE BROADER INTERESTS, THE ALLIED REPS WOULD BE WILLING TO CONVEY THESE IDEAS TO THEIR FRIENDS AND DISCUSS THEM.

15. US REP SAID THAT CONTINUAL MENTION OF ITALY BY THE SOVIETS OBLIGED HIM TO RECAPITULATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROBLEM. IN THEIR NOTES OF INVITATION, THE ALLIED GOVT HAD PROPOSED A SPECIAL STATUS FOR THE FLANK STATES. THE EASTERN COUNTRIES HAD REPLIED IN WRITING THAT THESE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FLANK STATES WERE ACCEPTABLE. THE ALLIED GOVTS HAD ALSO INVITED HUNGARY TO BECOME A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. THE EASTERN GOVTS HAD REPLIED IN TERMS WHICH THE ALLIED GOVTS HAD UNDERSTOOD TO BE ACCEPTANCE OF THIS PROPOSAL. ON ARRIVAL IN VIENNA, THE STATUS OF BULGARIA AND ROMANIA HAD  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02646 04 OF 05 021720 Z

ALSO BEEN ESTABLISHED BY COMMON AGREEMENT. THE EAST HAD THEN RAISED THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY. SINCE THE STATUS OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND ALL OTHER FLANK STATES HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED BY THAT TIME, THE ONLY QUESTION REMAINING OPEN WAS THAT OF HUNGARY. IT WAS ILLEGITIMATE TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF ITALY WHICH HAD ALREADY BEEN DECIDED IN WRITING AND TO DRAG IT INTO THE DISCUSSION FOR PURELY TACTICAL PURPOSES. THE ALLIED STATEMENTS DEALT WITH THE SOLE OPEN QUESTION. THEY WERE INTENDED TO BE NEUTRAL AND SHOULD BE EXAMINED CAREFULLY. IF, IN ADDITION, THE EAST WISHED TO HAVE A MORE GENERAL ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, THIS COULD BE EXAMINED.

16. KVITSINSKIY SAID THE ALLIES CLAIMED A DECISION ON HUNGARY HAD TO BE POSTPONED UNTIL A LATER STAGE. IF AT THAT LATER STAGE THE ALLIES THEN CAME BACK TO THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY, THEY MUST KNOW FROM WHAT THE EASTERN REPS HAD ALREADY SAID THAT THE EAST WOULD RAISE THE QUESTION OF ITALY. THIS WAS THE WAY IT WAS AND WHATEVER STATEMENTS WERE MADE HERE DID NOT CHANGE THAT FACT. THE ALLIES CLAIMED THAT STATEMENTS MUST BE MADE OR EXCHANGED. THIS WAS ADVANCE PAYMENT ON ISSUES WHICH WOULD BE DECIDED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND THE SOVIETS DO NOT WISH TO MAKE SUCH ADVANCE PAYMENT. NEITHER THE CONCEPT NOR THE CONTEXT OF SUCH STATEMENTS REPRESENTED A NEUTRAL APPROACH. ALL STATEMENTS WHICH FOCUSSED ON HUNGARY SHOULD BE LEFT ASIDE. THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA COVERED THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES COMPLETELY ADEQUATELY. TIMERBAYEV ADDED THAT THE WESTERN STATEMENTS WERE UNACCEPTABLE.

17. KHLESTOV SAID THAT FOR TWO MONTHS THE GROUP HAD BEEN WORKING TO FIND A SOLUTION TO WHICH STATES WOULD BE POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS RELATED TO THE REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THERE WOULD BE 11 SUCH PARTICIPANTS AND HUNGARY WOULD NOT BE INCLUDED. THE ALLIES WANTED HUNGARY IN; THE EAST SAID THAT IF HUNGARY WERE IN, THEN ITALY HAD TO BE IN. HE WOULD NOT REPEAT THE ENTIRE EASTERN ARGUMENTATION NOW, BUT HE CONSIDERED THE ARGUMENTATION WEIGHTLY AND ON THE BASIS OF THEM HIS GOVT HAD TAKEN A POSITION. HE COULD NOT SUBSCRIBE TO ARGUMENTS OR EVIDENCE TO MAKE IT APPEAR THAT ONLY THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION WAS OPEN. THE ORIGINAL SOVIET APPROACH

WAS THAT ALL 19 GOVT SHOULD BE INVOLVED ON AN EQUAL BASIS.  
THE SOVIETS HAD STATED IN WRITING THAT IT SHOULD BE THE JOB  
OF THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS TO DETERMINE THE PATTERN OF  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02646 04 OF 05 021720 Z

PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. THERE WAS APPARENT AGREE-  
MENT ON THIS POINT. BUT AT THE OUTSET OF THE PRESENT TALKS,  
THE ALLIED GOVTS HAD REJECTED THE IDEA THAT ALL COUNTRIES  
SHOULD HAVE THE SAME STATUS. THE ALLIES HAD SAID THE GROUP  
SHOULD BE DIVIDED INTO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND SPECIAL  
PARTICIPANTS. AFTER CONSIDERATION, THE SOVIETS HAD AGREED TO  
THIS CONCEPT OF DIVIDING THE GROUP INTO TWO CATEGORIES WITH  
THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS BEING CONSIDERED AS POTENTIAL PARTI-  
CIPANTS IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. THEREFORE EFFORTS TO GO BACK  
TO THE ORIGINAL EXCHANGE OF NOTES IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH A  
BASIS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF SEPARATE CATEGORIES WAS NOT A  
PRODUCTIVE ROUTE TO RESOLUTION OF THE PRESENT PROBLEM. MEMBERS  
OF THE GROUP SHOULD NOT SIT AROUND AND BLAME EACH OTHER BY  
USING PAST AGREEMENTS AND DISAGREEMENTS THE GROUP SHOULD MOVE ON  
AND NOT RETURN TO THE BEGINNING OF FEBRUARY. HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02646 05 OF 05 021739 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CCO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 ACDA-19 OMB-01 H-02 SS-14 NSC-10

RSR-01 /142 W

----- 084934

O P 021507 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8299

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY  
USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY  
USDEL SALT TWO  
USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 5 OF 5 VIENNA 2646

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

KHELSTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN REPS WERE NO LONGER AT THEIR ORIGINAL POSITION AS THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD CLAIMED. THE EARLIER EASTERN POSITION HAD BEEN THAT HUNGARY WAS DEFINITELY NOT TO BE A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. BUT NOW THEY WERE WILLING TO OFFER A COMPROMISE THAT THIS QUESTION SHOULD  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02646 05 OF 05 021739 Z

REMAIN OPEN. THIS WAS NOT THEIR ORIGINAL POSITION BUT A REAL COMPROMISE. BUT THE EASTERN REPS COULD NOT LEAVE THEMSELVES IN A POSITION WHERE, IF THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY WERE RAISED IN THE FUTURE, THE QUESTION OF ITALY WOULD ALREADY BE COMPLETELY PREJUDGED. THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD SAID THAT THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY IN THE GROUP OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS WOULD PREJUDGE THE WESTERN CASE AGAINST RAISING IT IN THE FUTURE BUT THE INCLUSION OF ITALY IN THE SAME GROUP WOULD ALSO PREDETERMINE THE STATUS OF ITALY, A CARDINAL ASPECT OF THE EASTERN POSITION OF EQUALITY OF THE TREATMENT OF THE TWO COUNTRIES. THEREFORE, HE COULD NOT GO ALONG WITH THIS APPROACH WHICH WAS NON- PRODUCTIVE BECAUSE IT LAID LIMITATIONS ON THE EAST FROM THE OUTSET.

18. KHLESTOV SAID THE EASTERN REPS RECOGNIZED THAT THE ALLIES HAD MADE A STEP IN SAYING THAT THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION SHOULD NOT BE DECIDED HERE AND NOW, BUT NONE- THELESS AS THE ALLIED REPS PRESENTED IT IN THEIR PROPOSED STATEMENTS, THE STATUS OF HUNGARY WOULD BE PARTIALLY PREDETERMINED BUT THE STATUS OF ITALY WOULD BE COMPLETELY PREDETERMINED BY ITS INCLUSION AMONG A GROUP OF 7 SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS. IF THE ALLIES WISHED TO CONVINCE THE EAST THAT THEY WERE NOT SEEKING A SPECIAL STATUS FOR HUNGARY, THEY SHOULD EXPRESS WILLINGNESS TO TREAT BOTH TOGETHER. THE ALLIES SHOULD EXAMINE THE WESTERN FORMULA CAREFULLY OR SEEK FOR SOME OTHER TRULY NEUTRAL APPROACH. THE EASTERN REPS WOULD EXAMINE THE TEXTS THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD READ TO THEM ON THE PRESENT OCCASION BUT IT WAS QUITE CLEAR THAT THEY CREATE A SPECIAL STATUS FOR ITALY WHICH THEY DID NOT GIVE TO HUNGARY. THIS WAS THE KERNAL OF THE PROBLEM AS THE ISSUE NOW HAD DEVELOPED, IT WAS TO LEAVE OPEN WHICH COUNTRIES SHOULD BE ADDIED TO THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIAPNTS. THIS POSSI-

BILITY COULD NOT BE RESTRICTED SOLELY TO HUNGARY. THE GROUP WOULD HAVE TO CONTINUE IN ITS EFFORT TO FIND A TRULY NEUTRAL COMPROMISE.

19. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT ONE PROBLEM WITH THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS THAT IT ATTEMPTED TO USE A SINGLE TYPE OF STATEMENT FOR THE CATEGORIES OF PROBLEMS. THE ALLIES WISHED TO SOLVE THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE. THE EAST APPARENTLY HAD IN MIND SOME WIDER PROBLEM. THESE WERE DIFFERENT ISSUES AND EACH SHOULD BE TREATED IN A DIFFERENT WAY.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02646 05 OF 05 021739 Z

20. HUNGARIAN REP SAID AS FAR AS HE COULD SEE THEY WERE NOT DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF PROBLEMS. REVERTING TO THE PRESENTATION MADE BY THE U. S. REP OF THE PAST HISTORY OF THE ISSUE, HE SAID THIS PRESENTATION WAS BASED ON THE PREVIOUS EXCHANGE OF NOTES. THE EXCHANGE OF NOTES WHICH HAD TAKEN PLACE COULD NOT CREATE A LEGAL OBLIGATION FOR HUNGARY TO BE IN ONE CATEGORY OR ANOTHER AS REGARDS PARTICIPATION. THE EASTERN PROPOSAL HAD BEEN THAT ALL STATES SHOULD PARTICIPATE ON AN EQUAL BASIS IN DETERMINING COMPOSITION OF THE PATTERN OR PARTICIPATION FOR THE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS. THIS MEANT THAT THE QUESTION WAS COMPLETELY OPEN WHEN THE PARTICIPANTS ARRIVED IN VIENNA.

21. THE US REP SAID THERE COULD BE NO SPECIAL STATUS FOR ITALY AS URGED BY KHLESTOV. THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA MIGHT HAVE SOME POSSIBILITIES WITH THE 19, 11 AND 7 FORMULA AS HE HAD EARLIER MENTIONED. ALTERNATIVELY IT COULD ALSO MENTION HUNGARY. THIS MIGHT BE A WAY TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM.

22. HUNGARIAN REP PETRAN QUESTIONED NETHERLANDS REP'S REMARK THAT THE CONSENSUS PROCEDURES ALREADY PROVIDED A BASIS FOR ENLARGEMENT AND THUS MADE THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA SUPERFLUOUS. HE BELIEVED THIS WAS A BROAD INTERPRETATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER. NETHERLANDS REP SAID HE THOUGHT IT NEVERTHELESS WAS APPLICABLE. US REP POINTED OUT THAT THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES SHOULD BE EXAMINED FURTHER. THE MADE IT CLEAR THAT THE DEGREE OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES WOULD BE DECIDED LATER. THE OUTCOME WAS NOT PREJUDGED. THIS WAS A BETTER WAY OF DOING WHAT THE EASTERN REPS HAD PROPOSED IN THEIR ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. HUNGARINA REP SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES WISHED HUNGARY TO MAKE A STATEMENT AT THIS TIME, IT WOULD HAVE TO INCLUDE MENTION OF ITALY. UNDER THE GENERAL ENLARGEMENT FORMULA HE PROPOSED, HOWEVER, IT WAS NOT EXCLUDED THAT THE HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT MIGHT PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE MEASURES WITHOUT RAISING THIS CONDITION SINCE SOME SUCH MEASURES MIGHT BE " INNOCENT," I. E., OF CLEAR BENEFIT OR NOT INJURIOUS TO HUNGARIAN INTERESTS.

23. IN A BRIEF CONCLUDING DISCUSSION, IT WAS AGREED THAT ALL

PROPOSALS ON THE TABLE WOULD BE EXAMINED FURTHER AT THE NEXT  
SESSION, WHICH WAS SET FOR THE MORNING OF APRIL 4 AT THE SOVIET  
EMBASSY. HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 07 MAY 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 02 APR 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973VIENNA02646  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730460/abqcelln.tel  
**Line Count:** 762  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION MBF  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 14  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 01 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <01-Aug-2001 by reddocgw>; APPROVED <29-Aug-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971118  
**Subject:** MBFR: NETHERLANDS AND US DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE WITH HUNGARIAN AND SOVIET REPS ON APRIL 2  
**TAGS:** PARM, AU, NL, UR  
**To:** STATE INFO SECDEF  
BONN  
HELSINKI  
LONDON  
MOSCOW  
NATO  
USNMR SHAPE



PRIORITY  
USCINCEUR  
USDOCOSOUTH  
SALT TWO II  
GENEVA

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005